

1 Neel Chatterjee (SBN 173985)

2 *nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com*

3 Andrew S. Ong (SBN 267889)

4 *aong@goodwinlaw.com*

5 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**

6 135 Commonwealth Drive

7 Menlo Park, California 94025

8 Tel.: +1 650 752 3100

9 Fax.: +1 650 853 1038

10 Attorneys for Defendant

11 CoreLogic, Inc.

12 Bruce J. Wecker (SBN 78530)

13 *bwecker@hausfeldllp.com*

14 Christopher L. Lebsock (SBN 184546)

15 *clebsock@hausfeldllp.com*

16 **HAUSFELD LLP**

17 600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3200

18 San Francisco, CA 94111

19 Tel: (415) 633-1908

20 Fax: (415) 358-4980

21 Attorneys for Plaintiff

22 Boundary Solutions, Inc.

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17 BOUNDARY SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Case No. 3:14-cv-00761-SK

18 Plaintiff,

**SECOND JOINT STATUS REPORT**

19 v.

Judge: Hon. Sallie Kim  
Courtroom: A—15th Floor

20 CORELOGIC, INC.,

21 Defendant.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Plaintiff Boundary Solutions, Inc. (“BSI”) and Defendant CoreLogic, Inc. (“CoreLogic”)  
 2 hereby respectfully submit their Second Joint Status Report. The parties previously submitted a  
 3 Joint Status Report on November 22, 2016. *See* Dkt. No. 126.

4 On February 19, 2014, Plaintiff BSI filed suit against CoreLogic alleging infringement of  
 5 U.S. Patent Nos. 7,092,957 (the “‘957 patent”); 7,499,946 (the “‘946 patent”); and 8,065,352 (the  
 6 “‘352 patent,” and collectively, the “Patents-in-Suit”). BSI alleges that the Patents-in-Suit are  
 7 directed at assembly, searching and display of digital parcel maps consisting of property boundary  
 8 information and associated data. The operative complaint (BSI’s second amended complaint)  
 9 alleges that CoreLogic is infringing the Patents-in-Suit. *See* Dkt. No. 41. On December 30, 2014,  
 10 Judge Grewal granted CoreLogic’s motion to dismiss BSI’s second complaint in part by finding that  
 11 BSI failed to cure the deficiencies in its pre-suit indirect infringement claim for the ’352 patent,  
 12 dismissing this claim with prejudice. *See* Dkt. No. 73.

13 On June 2, 2015, Judge Grewal stayed the case pending PTAB decisions regarding the  
 14 Patents-in-Suit. *See* Dkt. No. 121.

15 On May 19, 2016, the PTAB issued a series of Final Written Decisions resolving the *inter*  
 16 *partes* review petitions filed by CoreLogic. The decisions ruled the Patents-in-Suit herein  
 17 unpatentable. On July 15, 2016, Patent Owner Boundary Solutions filed appeals of two of these  
 18 decisions regarding the ’957 and ’946 patents. The cases have been consolidated and docketed in  
 19 the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit as Case No. 16-2354. **The Federal**  
 20 **Circuit has scheduled oral argument for the appeals on September 6, 2017.**

21 The parties submit that the current stay of this case should continue until a decision is  
 22 obtained from the Court of Appeals. Pursuant to the Court’s order, the parties will file an additional  
 23 status report in 120 days, on December 7, 2017.

24 //

25 //

1 Dated: August 9, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

2 By: /s/ Neel Chatterjee

3 Neel Chatterjee  
nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com  
4 Andrew S. Ong  
aong@goodwinlaw.com  
5 GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

6 Attorneys for Defendant  
7 CoreLogic, Inc.

8 Dated: August 9, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

9 By: /s/ Bruce J. Wecker (with permission)

10 Bruce J. Wecker  
*bwecker@hausfeldllp.com*  
11 Christopher L. Lebsack  
*clebsack@hausfeldllp.com*  
12 **HAUSFELD LLP**

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
14 Boundary Solutions, Inc.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1                   **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2                   I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the  
3                   United States District Court for the Northern District of California by using the CM/ECF system on  
4                   August 9, 2017. I further certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and  
5                   that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

6                   I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.  
7

8                   Dated: August 9, 2017

/s/ Neel Chatterjee

9                   Neel Chatterjee

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1                   **ATTORNEY ATTESTATION**

2                   Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I, Neel Chatterjee, hereby attest that concurrence in  
3 the filing of this document has been obtained from any signatories indicated by a “conformed”  
4 signatures (/s/) within this e-filed document.

5 Dated: August 9, 2017

6                   */s/ Neel Chatterjee*  
Neel Chatterjee

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28